

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application and are hereby amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification and specifically at page 13. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

**II. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS**

Claims 2-10 and 12-22 were objected to due to informalities. These claims are hereby amended, obviating the objection to these claims.

**III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-13, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

#### IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 to Kanungo et al.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,507 to Bohm et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livovsky et al.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livovsky et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

## V. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Amended independent claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*:

**“...downloading only desired electronic-program-guide data based on the extracted relevant-keyword information from the electronic-program-guide data stored in said electronic-program-guide database and the input retrieval keyword.”** (Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

(hereinafter, merely “Schein”) relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using program characteristics.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claim 11 is believed to be patentable.

As understood by Applicants, the other art made of record does not add any disclosure that would render claims 1 and 11 unpatentable.

## VI. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800